

Date: Mon, 7 Mar 94 04:30:31 PST
From: Ham-Equip Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-equip@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Equip-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Equip Digest V94 #55
To: Ham-Equip

Ham-Equip Digest Mon, 7 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 55

Today's Topics:

2m/70cm stub duck wanted
2m ssb
FT-530 vs IC W21AT
FT-530 vs TH-78A
GPS Receiver Boards
Help ID old SW Rcvr.?
ICOM R7100 - poor TV reception
mods for standard c228a & c628a?
Radio Shack.... All Sold Thanks!!!!
Santec HT-1200
TS830M + CW narrow. Possible?
TX-1, RX-1, Catalogs
Value of Yaesu 757GX II ??
Yaesu FT416 vs. FT11

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Equip-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Equip Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-equip".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 6 Mar 94 05:19:26 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!wylz@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: 2m/70cm stub duck wanted
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I am looking for a stubby duck antenna for use with my Yeasu FT530.

I've only been able to find stubbies for 2m, 1.25m, or 70cm, but nothing
for two bands.

Can anyone help?

Thanks much in advance.

Scott

--

```
=====
| Scott Ehrlich           Amateur Radio: wy1z       AMPRnet: wy1z@wa1phy.ampr.org |
| Internet: wy1z@neu.edu   BITnet: wy1z@NUHUB        AX.25: wy1z@wa1phy.ma.usa.na |
|-----|
|           Maintainer of the Boston Amateur Radio Club hamradio FTP area on      |
|           the World - ftp.std.com pub/hamradio                                |
|                                                                                   |
=====
```

Date: 4 Mar 1994 23:41:09 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!msuinfo!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!
gerald@cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 2m ssb
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Kevin- I would hate to have you make a terrible mistake like getting a FT-290rII instead of the fine TR-751. Its good you asked the net here.. The 290r is a very small and comprimised radio..if you really want small and can give up TX audio quality..and RX performance in every criteria, then the 290 is OK. Ive owned both..The 751 has a wonderfull clean transmitter- and the RX is rock stable and very hot with a GaAs Fet RF amp. The unit is one of Kenwoods real winners...unlike some other models. And the 290rII series is one of only a few Yaesu so-so radios. The 751 will cost you a few more bucks, but there is no compairison. Thats my two cents!

Bob AA5PB Austin

Date: 2 Mar 94 14:37:34 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!news.dell.com!lupus!
frank@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: FT-530 vs IC W21AT
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I'm interested in how these radios compare. The W21AT is more expensive

than the FT-530, is that because it's an ICOM? The W21AT is easily modified for wide receive (and transmit), is the same true for the 530?

Frank frank@lupus.dell.com

Date: 1 Mar 94 14:54:17 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!hamblin.math.byu.edu!yvax.byu.edu!sandersm@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: FT-530 vs TH-78A
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Feb27.205456.5736@yvax.byu.edu>, sandersm@yvax.byu.edu writes:
> I am debating whether to buy a Yaesu FT-530 or a Kenwood TH-78A. I would like
> to know experiences of owners of both radios. I am new to this hobby and would
> appreciate any info. 73's TNX Chad
>

Thanks for all the replies. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of the FT-530. The radio is now on its way.

Chad, KB7ZIU

Date: 7 Mar 1994 04:47:08 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!rkarlqu@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: GPS Receiver Boards
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

The Motorola GPS receiver is less than \$150 in 100's. It has six channels and just about all the features you would ever want.

Rick Karlquist N6RK
rkarlqu@scd.hp.com

Date: 5 Mar 1994 12:43:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!doc.ic.ac.uk!bright.ecs.soton.ac.uk!pdh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Help ID old SW Rcvr.?
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In <1994Mar4.194031.25091@news.csuohio.edu> mike@garfield.csuohio.edu (mike mayer) writes:

>Looking for help from some of you antique SW equipment buffs.

[excellent description deleted]

> RECEIVER BROADCAST
> P.C.R. No. 3 Mk. 1/2
 ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> ZA 30607 SERIAL No. R/RAC/PE/ 377

You got it right there actually, it's a PCR3.
Made by Pye I believe. A lot of them were sold off during
the late 60s. I'll try to find out a bit more and I'll Email
you with what I get.

--

[] Peter Harris, Optoelectronics Network Supervisor, Southampton University []

"Sir, you will either die on the gallows or of the pox !"

"That, my Lord, depends on whether I embrace your principles or your mistress"

John Wilkes to The Earl of Sandwich, Parliament, November 1763

Date: 4 Mar 1994 21:24:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!ornews.intel.com!landesk!
bmiller@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ICOM R7100 - poor TV reception
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar3.054923.15182@nosc.mil> keating@nosc.mil (Roger Keating)
writes:

>I don't have the answer to the question Bradley offers, but I'm

>interested in

>learning more about the TVR7100 module and its reportedly poor

>performance.

>

>I have little trouble getting TV and FM radio from great distances with

>a simple random wire antenna in a poor location near my apartment.

>I have considered getting the TV reception module but am still curious

>about

>its performance with the recvr.

>

>What sort of poor performance has been seen Bradley?

>

>Roger Keating - KD6EFQ
>keating@nosc.mil

Based on my experience with my R-7000 and the TV module, it will not measure up to what your average TV can do. It would be a waste of money if your primary interest was to watch TV (noraml broadcast). As a matter of fact I use my R-7000 several times a week and have not turned on the TV module in 2 years! I would be interested if there was a fix for this as Bradley asks.

--
Brett Miller N70LQ E-mail: brett_miller@ccm.hf.intel.com
Intel Corp.
American Fork, UT

Date: Sat, 5 Mar 1994 06:14:56 GMT
From: rci!pfc@uunet.uu.net
Subject: mods for standard c228a & c628a?
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Does anyone have modifications for the standard C228A and/or C628A?

Thanks!

--
-----Paul Frank Covello
pfc@rci.ripco.com
pfc@ripco.com
-or- pfc@rci.chi.il.us

Date: Sat, 5 Mar 1994 07:23:26 GMT
From: envoy!equinox.unr.edu!dsring@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Radio Shack.... All Sold Thanks!!!!
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

To All Who Replied To The Radio Shack Equipment Posting.
Thank You Very Much!!!!
All Equipment Has Been Sold!!!!
Thanks Again!!!

AND 73'S

Douglas S. Ring

....Gee now I wish somebody would buy my Icom Package :) !!!!!!!.....

--

Douglas S. Ring
University Of Nevada, Reno
Electrical Engineering Major
email: dsring@equinox.unr.edu
Telephone: (702) 626-5516
Fax: (702) 626-3840

Amateur Radio Operator
KB7QMD-Advanced Class
HZ1AB-Operating Member
V.Chair-UNR Radio Club

Assalamu Aleikum
(May peace be upon you)

Date: 6 Mar 1994 16:16:04 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.ans.net!
hp81.prod.aol.net!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Santec HT-1200
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Does anyone have the pin out for the Speaker/Mike on the top of this 2m rig?
I know it's ancient, but we have one and would like to use it for packet. Any
input, please email me..

73 de Bob KA5GLX BIEKERT@aol.com

Date: 7 Mar 94 10:53:09 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: TS830M + CW narrow. Possible?
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Hello,
I'm wondering if anybody can help me. I'd like to install a CW narrow filter
on a Kenwood TS830M although the factory says that it's not possible.
I don't care doing it in the hard way even putting a switch in the rear

panel or doing some mods on the board itself but I want to hear from someone who attempted this before to be sure that it's feasible since I still have to buy the rig.

The more info you guys can give me the better it is.

Thank you!

Marco

aa1iu/ix1iiy

--

```
-----
Marco Fassiotto      | Voice : +39-125-524650 | ham  : ix1iiy/aa1iu
System Software Engineer | Fax :   +39-125-524294 | pkt  : ix1iiy@ik1brm
Laser Printers       | Data:   +39-125-524374 |-----
Olivetti             | Internet : fax@sparc4.ico.olivetti.com
                    |                    fax%sparc4@olivetti.com
-----
```

Date: 28 Feb 94 16:51:08 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!

news.eecs.nwu.edu!fidogate.nuars.nwu.edu!nwugate.fidonet.org!

f747.n115.z1.fidonet.org!Don.Merz@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

Subject: TX-1, RX-1, Catalogs

To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Vintage Radio Gear And Literature For Sale

CONTACT: Don Merz, N3RHT: 47 Hazel Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15228

412-234-8819 (weekdays, EST) or 412-344-0956 (eves and WEs to 10PM)

I am a collector, trader and hobbyist, not a business. OFFERS AND TRADES ARE WELCOME. Full payment is requested in advance. Shipping costs extra and takes 3 to 4 weeks because I am slow. Thanks.

These are the latest additions to a lengthy list posted in Compuserve HAMNET Library 10 in the file RADIOS.TXT...or available by sending a 2-stamp LSASE to me at the above address.

JUST IN TIME FOR ST. PATRICK'S DAY...

Big Green Machines:

Heathkit TX-1 Apache transmitter. Excellent looking, though there is some light surface rust on the back only. Complete, Unmodified. Untested. \$195
Heathkit RX-1 Mohawk receiver. Excellent looking. Works. Complete. Unmodified.

\$245.

OR Buy the pair for \$395.

Sams (Radio) Photofacts number 1: \$39

Sams Photofacts numbers 3, 7, 8, 9: \$19 each

Sams Photofacts numbers 15, 16, 17, 29, 40: \$6.50 each

The VHF Amateur, 16 issues, 1961-63: \$49

1968 Lafayette catalog: \$14

Allied Radio Catalogs: 1949, 51: \$29 each

Allied Radio Catalogs: 1955, 58: \$22 each

Allied Radio Catalogs: 1963, 65, 66: \$14 each

World Radio Catalogs: 1949 (\$31), 1957 (\$26), 1965, 66: \$18 each

World Radio Catalogs: 1967, 69: \$15 each

Radio Shack 1962 Catalog: \$12

Sargent WAC-44 Parts Radio. Poor cosmetic and electrical condition. Good
S-meter, dial, tuning knobs and transformers. As-is: \$33

X SLMR 2.1a X

Date: Sat, 5 Mar 1994 16:33:29 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.utdallas.edu!wupost!
csus.edu!netcom.com!wroth@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Value of Yaesu 757GX II ??
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Kenneth Guthrie (Kenneth.Guthrie@launchpad.unc.edu) wrote:
: Hello All,

: I have a friend who wants to trade me a Yaesu 757GX II in on a ham radio I
: have. The radio has the matching power supply with it and both are in
: excellent condition but I have no idea of the value of his equipment nor
: how hard/easy it would be to re-sell. Any ideas?

I was able to get \$625 for my 757GXII without power supply when I sold
it. It's a good rig, with the exception of only having 10 memory
channels, and not being able to store splits in memory (for 10m
repeaters). Also the front end overloads fairly easily if you have the
"preamp" on.

73's,
Wayne

WA2N / 5

--

wroth@netcom.com

Date: 5 Mar 1994 04:33:37 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!news.Brown.EDU!noc.near.net!ctron-news.ctron.com!dur-
news.ctron.com!slama@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Yaesu FT416 vs. FT11
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Hello,

Keeping this short...

I am considering purchasing either the FT416 or FT11 for use on
hiking trips.

It would be greatly appreciated if someone who is knowledgeable about
these HTs could respond.

I am trying to decide which would suit my needs the most. Some points
that I would like input on are:

1. How is the "Advanced Track Tuning (ATT)" on the 416 an
 advantage over the 11? When will its usefulness
 become evident?
2. Ruggedness. Which of the two is more susceptible to
 cold/shock (physical abuse)?
3. Does the FT-11 support CTCSS encode AND decode? DTMF?
4. Does the FT-11 have adjustable power output? This
 is an important consideration for me, as I wish
 to conserve as much power as possible on trips.
 The 416 does, does the FT-11? If so, how many levels
 of adjustment are there?
5. The FT-11 is *really* small. That is an advantage when space
 is an issue. BUT, the difference in size between this
 and the 416 is secondary when it comes down to
 features. In other words, I am willing to sacrifice
 size for functionality.
5. Overall. How does it "feel"?

Thanks!
Fred

Date: 1 Mar 94 23:31:06 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!
casbah.acns.nwu.edu!rdewan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <henrysCLzps3.4Ez@netcom.com>, <1994Mar1.162350.22173@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<2l0bor\$g9m@ncar.ucar.edu>h.acns
Subject : Re: MFJ SWR Analyzers

In article <2l0bor\$g9m@ncar.ucar.edu>, Kim Elmore <elmore@rap.ucar.edu> wrote:

>Taking resonance, when the antenna impedance is purely resistive; any
>deviation from that point will yield a rise in SWR regardless of the
>impedance value due to the reactive components. Have I missed
>something?
>

I am afraid so. If what you say were true then it would not be possible
to match, let us say 10 ohm resistive, with a 50 ohm system using
only reactive components. But this is not correct.

Reductio ad absurdum implies...

Rajiv
aa9ch
r-dewan@nwu.edu

Date: 6 Mar 1994 16:19:40 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <CSLE87-010394114555@145.39.1.10>, <2l19sm\$fvj@hp-col.col.hp.com>,
<CSLE87-020394100132@145.39.1.10>
Subject : Re: DTMF & CTCSS [Was: HTX-202 Audio]

Karl Beckman (CSLE87) wrote:

: No, Bob, most commercial decoders are reliable down to the equivalent of
: 250 Hz deviation even at 6dB quieting levels; yes, they do have low-pass
: filters to avoid "talking off" from the actual voice deviation or noise.

: Amateur repeaters shouldn't require that kind of sensitivity unless the
: users have DX-contest-honed listening skills that will enable them to hear
: the voice clearly at 6dBq. Most repeater users or owners will not tolerate
: that noisy a signal being broadcast on their repeater, especially with
: their own callsign for ID.

I guess we must have an unusually large number of DX-contest
operators on our machines.... it seems that many people want
to push the limits of repeater coverage. :-)

: > all variations in the system. Isn't the real solution to always make
: > sure that the DTMF decoder is protected from CTCSS tones if such
: > tones are in use on a repeater?

: Yes, the PROPER way to do DTMF is directly from the discriminator through
: dual isolation amplifier/filter stages, one with a strong roll-off above
: 200 Hz for the CTCSS deck, and the other with a bandpass filter from 500
: to 1700 Hz just for the DTMF decoder. However, if you are in the market
: for a repeater controller, check the schematics and see how few amateur
: repeater controllers or patches actually DO include the filters. The
: manufacturers apparently assume that the repeater audio or discriminator
: output will be filtered, but that defeats the purpose of having the direct
: discriminator output in the first place!

For better or for worse, it seems that most (all?) repeater controllers
expect the repeater operator to deal with the whole CTCSS issue external
to the controller. The CTCSS decoder goes external, high pass filtering
to protect the DTMF decoder (and other devices) must be external.
Some controllers make a token effort at FM deemphasis.

I suppose that the reason for all of this is historical.
I'd prefer that the controllers handle all this internally, with
coupled-down-to-20-Hz audio in and out of the RF gear.

Bob Witte / bobw@col.hp.com / Hewlett Packard PMO / KB0CY / (719) 590-3230

Date: 1 Mar 94 16:45:54 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!ncar!asuvax!
pitstop.mcd.mot.com!mcdphx!schbbs!mothost!lmpsbbs!NewsWatcher!
user@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <ah301-210294080950@sy_j.pgh.wec.com>, <CLn8o3.E4p@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>,
<fred-mckenzie-280294165032@k4dii.ksc.nasa.gov>d
Subject : Re: htx-202 audio mod (?)

In article <fred-mckenzie-280294165032@k4dii.ksc.nasa.gov>, fred-mckenzie@ksc.nasa.gov (Fred McKenzie) wrote:

...MUCH DELETED...

>
> Adjustments for CTCSS and DTMF tone levels are each independent of the voice
> level adjustment. This is necessary for the CTCSS, since the tone must be
> injected after the voice limiter circuit.
>
> My DTMF levels were in agreement with the service manual, although I forget
> what they were. The real problem with the HTX-202's DTMF signal, is the
> fact that the high tone and low tone of each tone pair, are at the same
> level. Telephone company standards require that the high group of tones be
> at a higher level than the low frequency group. (I think the required
> difference is 6 dB.)

No, the AT&T spec is that there should be *NO* difference in the phone line levels between high and low groups (called "twist"). Usually the decoder can tolerate about 3 dB difference at >20dB S/N levels. Better decoders will have higher allowable levels of twist (up to 6-8 dB) and/or lower S/N requirements while still decoding reliably.

The problem is that some amateur autopatches are connected directly from the discriminator (ahead of the de-emphasis filter) and some connect to the audio stages after the filters. Unfortunately, many hams serving as repeater engineers seem to regard the two points as only having different audio levels. They don't realize that the audio response is significantly different. The result is both poor line audio and problems accessing and controlling patch functions.

>
> To the best of my knowledge, this is the only REAL bug with the radio. I
> haven't seen it, but I understand there is a Radio Shack service bulletin
> on adjusting the DTMF level. It reportedly states that you should "adjust
> it until it works"! Obviously, there have been complaints about problems
> with autopatch.

This is also a common problem. Many operators adjust the DTMF to the same level as voice peaks, which severely distorts the tones. The proper level for DTMF is 3.0 to 3.5 kHz if your rig is adjusted for deviation limiting at 5.0 kHz. I also recommend that DTMF be sent *WITHOUT* CTCSS, or the CTCSS must be set to no more than 350 Hz deviation to maintain the 20dB S/N ratio into the DTMF decoder. Remember that if you take audio directly from the discriminator, there is no filter to keep CTCSS out of the decoder.

Almost all amateur DTMF/Patch problems can be cured by following these simple guidelines.

>
> 73, Fred, K4DII

--
Karl Beckman, P.E. < STUPIDITY is an elemental force for which >
Motorola Comm - Fixed Data < no earthquake is a match. -- Karl Kraus >

Some of the opinions expressed above aren't even claimed by the author!
Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI

End of Ham-Equip Digest V94 #55
